UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,708	09/30/2003	Sheng Lee	66329/33292	6329

23380 7590 12/20/2006

TUCKER, ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING
925 EUCLID AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1414

EXAMINER	
HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2196	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/20/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,708	LEE, SHENG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tauqir Hussain	2196	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *05/16/2005 and 09/30/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims1-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coss et al. (EP 09090072 A2), hereinafter "Coss" in view of Boden et al. (Pub. No.: US 2001/0000193 A1), hereinafter "Boden".

4. As to claim 1, Coss discloses, method for an administrator to restrict access to a device parameter over a distributed computer system, the steps comprising ([0031, lines 20-22]):

specifying an address range associated with a data packet ([0036, Step-702, lines 25-26]);

generating at least one filter corresponding to the specified address range (0036, Fig.7, Step-701-703, lines 24-28]), wherein the filter includes,

a reference address ([0034, line 53-54]),

an address mask([0034, line, 53-54], where domain name translates to IP and each IP has an subnet mask associated with it), and

an instruction representative of a desired action to be taken for a correlating address ([0036, Step-702, lines 25-27], where specified domain is selected by packet's address range);

receiving an incoming packet ([0034, line 51]);

comparing a source address of the incoming packet to the reference address to determine a correlating address ([0034, lines 56-57]); and

executing the instruction representative of the desired action in accordance with the source address of the incoming packet ([0034, Step-501-504, lines 45-58).

Coss does not explicitly disclose, comparing source packet with reference address. However, It is well know in the art and obvious from the teachings of Coss in (step-504, [0034, lines 56-57]) that source address is searched through rule table for address matching and upon finding the matching results, it decides whether to deny or accept the packet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Coss in order to make an obvious variation of comparing the packet's source address with reference address for legitimacy of packet so it can be dropped and save further processing time for that particular packet.

5. As to claim 13, Coss discloses, system for an administrator to restrict access to a device parameter over a distributed computer system ([0031, lines 20-22]), comprising:

means adapted for specifying an address range associated with a data packet ([0036, Step-702, lines 25-26]);

means adapted for generating at least one filter corresponding to the specified address range (0036, Fig.7, Step-701-703, lines 24-28]), wherein the filter includes,

a reference address ([0034, line 53-54]),

an address mask ([0034, line, 53-54], where domain name translates to IP and each IP has an subnet mask associated with it), and

an instruction representative of a desired action to be taken for a correlating address ([0036, Step-702, lines 25-27], where specified domain is selected by packet's address range);

means adapted for receiving an incoming packet ([0034, line 51]);

means adapted for comparing a source address of the incoming packet to the reference address to determine a correlating address ([0034, lines 56-57]); and

means adapted for executing the instruction representative of the desired action in accordance with the source address of the incoming packet ([0034, Step-501-504, lines 45-58).

Coss does not explicitly disclose, comparing source packet with reference address. However, It is well know in the art and obvious from the teachings of Coss in (step-504, [0034, lines 56-57]) that source address is searched through rule table for address matching and upon finding the matching results, it decides whether to deny or accept the packet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Coss in order to make an obvious variation of comparing the packet's source address with reference address for legitimacy of packet so it can be dropped and save further processing time for that particular packet.

6. As to claim 2, Coss discloses the method further comprising:

performing a bitwise AND operation between the source address and the address mask ([0034, page.6, lines 5-12]);

performing a bitwise AND operation between the reference address and the address mask ([0034, page.6, lines 5-12]); and

Coss does not disclose explicitly about comparing the outcomes of bitwise operation. However, Boden discloses, comparing the outcomes of the bitwise AND operations, wherein equal outcomes results in the correlating address, and wherein not equal outcomes results in an address outside the specified range (Fig.4, Step-320 and

Step-330, [0034, lines 18-24], that applying 6-tuples and performing the bitwise operation produces the results as whether to accept or deny the packet by setting up the rules (which is purely a matter of design choice).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to resolve filtering rules for each IP packet at the physical interface.

7. As to claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2 above.

8. As to claim 3, Coss teaches, the method, wherein the desired action includes an instruction to block the incoming packet ([0030, line 26], Fig.3, Rule-20 has an associated "drop" action).

9. As to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 3 above.

10. As to claim 4, Coss does not discloses the method further comprising the step of dropping the incoming packet with a source address inside the specified address range.

However, Boden teaches, all incoming packet gets through first filter, which means all incoming packets consists of out of range as well as within the range packets and second filter drop the packets based on packets port assignments ([0027, lines 1-4]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to fast filter packet before going through further filtering process.

11. As to claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 4 above.

12. As to claim 5, Coss does not disclose, the method further comprising the step of allowing the incoming packet with a source address outside the specified address range.

However, Boden teaches, allowing all TCP/IP packets through first filter. ([0027, lines 1-4], allows all TCP/IP packets regardless of correct address range).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to fast filter packet before going through further process.

13. As to claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 5 above.

14. As to claim 6, Coss does not disclose, the method, further comprising the step of processing packets where source address is out of specified range.

However, Boden teaches, processing the incoming packet with the source address outside the specified address range ([0027, lines 1-4], after receiving all the incoming packets, packets are processed and dropped based on the source or destination ports).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to fast filter packet before going through further filtering process.

15. As to claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 6 above.

16. As to claim 7, Coss discloses, the method, wherein the desired action includes an instruction to allow the incoming packet ([0030, line 26], Fig.3, Rule-10 "pass" action).

17. As to claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 7 above.

18. As to claim 8, Coss teaches, the method, further comprising the step of processing the incoming packet ([0034, lines 45-47]).

19. As to claim 20, the claim is rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 8 above.

20. As to claim 9, Coss does not disclose, the method, further comprising the step of blocking packet if source address is outside the address range.

However, Boden teaches, blocking the incoming packet with a source address outside the specified address range ([0026, lines 3-5]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to fast filter packet before going through further filtering process.

21. As to claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 9 above.

22. As to claim 10, Coss does not disclose explicitly, the method, further comprising the step of dropping the incoming packet with the source address outside the specified address range.

However, Boden teaches, dropping the incoming packet with a source address outside the specified address range ([0026, lines 3-5]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to fast filter packet before going through further filtering process.

23. As to claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 10 above.

24. As to claim 11, Coss does not disclose, the method, wherein the filter is incorporated inside an SNMP agent.

However, Boden teaches, SNMP is a well-known technique in the art at the time the invention was made and using SNMP obviously implies to have commands associated with the protocol ([0027, lines 1-7]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Coss with the teachings of Boden in order to fast filter packet before going through further filtering process.

25. As to claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 11 above.

26. As to claim 12, Coss discloses, the method, wherein the source address and the reference address are an Internet Protocol address ([0032, lines 29-33] and [0034, lines 53-54], where domain address is a reference address).

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Conclusion

McNamee (Pub. No.: US 2004/0117488 A1) discloses a communication traffic acceptance control method and a Protocol Data Unit filtering gateway are presented.

Heiney et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0207866 A1) discloses, computer program products and print server for discovering printers connected to a print server.

Kominsky (Pub. No.: US 2003/0018591 A1) discloses, small, optimized sequence of binary 5-tupples, representing filter rules.

Swander et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0250131 A1) discloses, system for adding, removing and managing a plurality of network policy filter.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tauqir Hussain whose telephone number is 571-272-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El Hady can be reached on 571 272 3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TH

N. El Hady

NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER